

Application No. 09/362,022

### **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action of March 8, 2005, Applicants have carefully considered the rejections of the Examiner in the above-identified application. In light of this consideration, Applicants believe that the claims as now amended are allowable. Claims 13-17 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the application.

In the first Office Action of March 31, 2003, claims 1-3, 9, 13, and 14 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over co-pending patent 09/362,022. Claims 1-3, 9, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,555,557 to Mailloux (hereinafter Mailloux). Claims 4-8, 10-12, and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Mailloux and further in view of the Applicants' cited well-known art.

In the second Office Action of September 29, 2003, claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 9 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,818,504 to Chung et al. (hereinafter Chung). Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,847,641 to Tung and in further view of Chung. Claims 4-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Tung and in further view of Chung and further in view of the Applicants' cited well-known prior art. Claims 10-12 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Chung and further in view of the Applicants' cited well-known prior art. Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Chung and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,181,438, to Bracco (hereinafter Bracco).

Application No. 09/362,022

In the third Office Action of June 16, 2004, claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1-3, 9, and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,740,330 to Abe (hereinafter Abe) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,299,308 to Suzuki et al. (hereinafter Suzuki). Claims 4-8, 10-12, and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Abe and in further view of Suzuki and further in view of prior art.


In this the fourth Office Action of March 8, 2005, claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,266,154 to Allen (hereinafter Allen). Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Allen and in further view of well known prior art. Claims 1-12 are indicated as allowable subject matter. The Applicants wish to express their appreciation for this indication by the Examiner.

Claims 13-17 are canceled, and given that claims 1-12 are indicated as allowable subject matter, this application should thereby be in condition for allowance. Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Application No. 09/362,022

It is respectfully submitted that the present set of claims are patentably distinct over the cited references. In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, she is hereby requested to call the undersigned attorney at (585) 423-6918, Rochester, NY.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher D. Wait  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 43,230  
Telephone (585) 423-6918

March 14, 2005  
CDW/fsl  
Xerox Corporation  
Xerox Square 20A  
Rochester, New York 14644